



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,651	02/19/2002	Loren L. Rademacher	1094.193US1	5284

21186 7590 09/29/2003

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

LEE, KYUNG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2832

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center"><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b></p> <p align="center">10/078,651</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b></p> <p align="center">RADEMACHER ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b></p> <p align="center">Richard K. Lee</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b></p> <p align="center">2832</p>	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                            | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>0203</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Claims should begin on a new page instead of continuing from the detail description of the invention. See page 8 of the specification.

2. Claim 3 recites "The transfer switch of claim 3..."

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 and 4-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al. (4,849,590) in view of Kalvaitis et al. (4,791,530; Applicant submitted).

Becker et al. teaches a transfer switch as claimed except for a flux barrier at least partially near the conductive path.

Kalvaitis et al. teaches a flux barrier 40, 42 (fig. 1) between the switch stacks for providing physical separation and isolation between phases (col. 1, lines 20-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide switch device of Becker et al. with the flux barriers as taught by Kalvaitis et al., since the barriers of Kalvaitis et al. would provide the switch of Becker et al. with physical separation and isolation between phases between the stacks.

Art Unit: 2832

Regarding claim 2, the barrier of Kalvaitis et al. is a planar sheet (see fig. 3).

Regarding claims 4, 5 and 7, Kalvaitis et al. discloses a plurality of conductive paths of cassettes (col. 4, line 1 and see fig. 1).

Regarding claim 6, the barrier 40 is secured to at least one of the cassettes (see fig. 7 of Kalvaitis et al. for securing the barrier).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, “different portions” of the barrier positioned between the cassettes is shown by fig. 3 of Kalvaitis et al. (barrier 52 compared to barrier 40).

Regarding claim 10, Becker et al. and Kalvaitis et al. disclose the claimed invention except for “the barrier being integral with one other.” It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the separate pieces of the barrier, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article that has formally been formed in two pieces involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 11-16, the method steps as claimed are deemed obvious in view of the functions of the structure in the combination discussed above.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3 recites the planar sheet made of steel. Prior art of record employs insulative materials for the flux barrier. Use of steel flux barriers are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record.

Art Unit: 2832

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard K. Lee whose telephone number is (703) 306-9060. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri. 5:30AM to 2:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin G. Enad can be reached on (703) 308-7619. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

Richard K. Lee  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2832

